



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/077,539	02/15/2002	Jim Somerset	SPL-1	3580
20808	7590	05/04/2005	EXAMINER	
BROWN & MICHAELS, PC 400 M & T BANK BUILDING 118 NORTH TIOGA ST ITHACA, NY 14850			CARTER, MONICA SMITH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3722	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/077,539	SOMERSET ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Monica S. Carter	3722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 15-17 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/25/03

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the zip closure (claim 5) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 11 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 11, line 1, "claim1" should be replaced with "claim 1".

In claim 13, the period is missing from the end of the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5 and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Givati (4,974,983).

Givati discloses a plurality of pages (3) each having at least one pouch (31) for holding a card and holes (132) to inset the pages into a binder (2); and sheets (4) having at least holes for inserting the sheets into a binder (as seen in figure 1).

Givati discloses the claimed invention except for the specific arrangement and/or content of indicia (cards having at least two sets of at least times of a day and printed calendar sheets including a plurality of columns with headings and a duplicate of times listed on the cards) set forth in the claim(s). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide any desired indicia on the sheets, since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the

desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of sheet does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability. Thus, there is no novel and unobvious functional relationship between the printed matter and the substrate which is required for patentability.

The card being a "lead" card sets forth the intended use of the card. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Regarding claims 2, 3, 7 and 9-11, see the above rejections regarding printed matter (*In re Gulack*).

Regarding claim 4, matters related to the choice of ornamentation producing no mechanical effect or advantage considered to constitute the invention are considered obvious and do not impart patentability. *In re Seid*, 73 USPQ 431.

Regarding claim 5, the process of sealing the center cavity does not structurally limit the claim. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. Product-by-Process claims are not limited to the manipulations of recited steps, only the structure implied by the steps. (See MPEP 2113)

Regarding claim 8, the pages and sheets are inserted into a binder (2) (as seen in figure 1).

Regarding claim 12, Givati discloses the kit for tracking information and appointments as set forth in claim 1.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Givati in view of Bakke et al. (6,135,662).

Givati discloses the claimed invention except for the pouch containing at least four pouches located on the outsides sides of the page.

Bakke et al. disclose a lesson planner comprising a pouch having a plurality of pouches (pockets) on the outside sides of the page (as seen in figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the pouch of Givati to include a plurality of pouches, as taught by Bakke et al., to provide the holder with additional storage space.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kershaw (5,433,546).

Kershaw discloses a method of tracking information and appointments comprising getting a planner tool (10); using the tool to keep track of expenses appointments and daily tasks. Providing mileage could be kept on a daily basis and therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include mileage information for tracking travel associated with personal and job related expenses.

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kershaw in view of Givati, as above.

Kershaw discloses the claimed invention except for the claimed planner tool.

Givati discloses a plurality of pages (3) each having at least one pouch (31) for holding a card and holes (132) to inset the pages into a binder (2); and sheets (4) having at least holes for inserting the sheets into a binder (as seen in figure 1).

Givati discloses the claimed invention except for the specific arrangement and/or content of indicia (cards having at least two sets of at least times of a day and printed calendar sheets including a plurality of columns with headings and a duplicate of times listed on the cards) set forth in the claim(s). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide any desired indicia on the sheets, since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the

desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of sheet does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability. Thus, there is no novel and unobvious functional relationship between the printed matter and the substrate which is required for patentability.

The card being a "lead" card sets forth the intended use of the card. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the planner of Kershaw with card holder sheets and other sheets, as taught by Givati, for tracking the user's appointments and other related information.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 15-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited references disclose organizing devices.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica S. Carter whose telephone number is (571) 272-4475. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (6:00 AM - 3:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on (571) 272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May 2, 2005

Monica S. Carter
MONICA S. CARTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER